

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

LARRY HILL, an individual,

Plaintiff,

vs.

No. 2:13-cv-11072  
Hon. Gerald E. Rosen

CLARK KENT, a detective,

Defendant.

---

**ORDER DISMISSING CASE UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)  
AND ENJOINING PLAINTIFF FROM FILING FURTHER  
COMPLAINTS WITHOUT FIRST OBTAINING LEAVE OF COURT**

Plaintiff Larry Hill commenced the above-captioned case in this Court on March 8, 2013. Accompanying Plaintiff's *pro se* complaint was an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, which the Court has granted. Having reviewed the allegations of Plaintiff's now-filed complaint, the Court readily concludes that this suit must be dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) as frivolous and for failure to state a claim.

Plaintiff has been a frequent litigant in this district, filing at least four cases, besides the present case, that have been promptly dismissed as "frivolous," "devoid of merit," and "incomprehensible." *See, e.g., Hill v. Davis, et al.*, No. 2:09-13040 (filed 7/31/2009; dismissed 8/11/2009) ("complaint is, on its face, frivolous and devoid of merit."); *Hill v. Hullchanink*, No. 12-11912

(filed 4/27/2012; dismissed 4/30/2012) (“complaint is largely illegible, entirely incomprehensible, does not mention defendant except in the caption, and fails to state a claim against the defendant or anyone else.”); *Hill v. Cartwright*, 10-11116 (filed 3/19/2010; dismissed 3/26/2010) (“Court cannot discern sufficient facts to support a viable federal claim.”); *Hill v. City of Detroit Treasury Department*, No. 11-13406 (filed August 4, 2011; dismissed August 22, 2011). Indeed, on the same day this suit was filed, Plaintiff filed a similar complaint in this Court, which has yet to be resolved. *Hill v. Ashby*, No. 13-11064 (filed March 8, 2013).

The complaint in the present suit is no different. Its single paragraph consists entirely of jumbled, disjointed names, birthdates, and social security numbers with no indication of how they support a viable theory of recovery. Indeed, Defendant is not even mentioned outside of the caption. In addition, there is no hint of any basis for this Court’s exercise of subject matter jurisdiction. It readily follows that this case is subject to dismissal under § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) and (ii) as frivolous and for failure to state a claim on which relief may be granted.

The Court also concludes that Plaintiff should be enjoined from commencing any further litigation in the Eastern District of Michigan, unless and until he first secures leave of the Court to do so. As the Sixth Circuit observed, “[t]here is nothing unusual about imposing prefiling restrictions in

matters with a history of repetitive or vexatious litigation.” *Feathers v. Chevron U.S.A., Inc.*, 141 F.3d 264, 269 (6th Cir. 1998); *see also Ortman v. Thomas*, 99 F.3d 807, 811 (6th Cir. 1996) (“[I]t is permissible to require one who has abused the legal process to make a showing that a tendered lawsuit is not frivolous or vexatious before permitting it to be filed.”).

Accordingly,

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED that the above-captioned case is DISMISSED under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) and (ii).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff Larry Hill is ENJOINED AND RESTRAINED from filing any new complaints in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan without first petitioning for and obtaining leave from the presiding judge of this Court.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: March 13, 2013

s/Gerald E. Rosen  
GERALD E. ROSEN  
CHIEF JUDGE, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was mailed to the attorneys of record on this date, Wednesday, March 13, 2013, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

s/Julie Owens  
Case Manager, (313) 234-5135